Page 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION ADJUSTACAM, LLC) () (CIVIL DOCKET NO.) (6:10-CV-329 VS.) (TYLER, TEXAS) () (FEBRUARY 9, 2012 AMAZON.COM, INC., ET AL.)(9:00 A.M. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE JOHN D. LOVE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE APPEARANCES: FOR THE PLAINTIFF: (See Attorney Sign-In Sheet) FOR THE DEFENDANTS: (See Attorney Sign-In Sheet) COURT REPORTER: SHELLY HOLMES, Texas CSR 7804 Expiration Date: 12/31/12 Sunbelt Reporting & Litigation 6575 West Loop South, Suite 580 Bellaire, Texas 77401 (903) 593-3213 (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced on a CAT system.)

Sunbelt Reporting & Litigation Services

Houston Austin Bryan/College Station Corpus Christi Dallas/Fort Worth East Texas San Antonio

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING

			Page 2
1	I N D E X		
2			
3			
4	February 9, 2012		
5		Page	
6	Appearances	1	
7	Hearing	3	
8	Court Reporter's Certificate	98	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	Page 3	
1	COURTROOM CLERK: All rise.	
2	THE COURT: Please be seated.	
3	All right. Ms. Morris, you may call the	
4	case.	
5	COURTROOM CLERK: The Court calls Case No.	
6	6:10-CV-329, Adjustacam versus Amazon.com, et al.	
7	THE COURT: Announcements.	
8	MR. SPANGLER: Good morning. Andrew	
9	Spangler on behalf of the Plaintiff. With me today is	
10	Mr. John Edmonds and Mr. Johnathan	
11	MR. YAZDANI: Yazdani.	
12	MR. SPANGLER: Yazdani, yes. And we're	
13	ready, Your Honor.	
14	THE COURT: All right. And for the	
15	Defendants?	
16	MR. CRAFT: Morning, Your Honor, Brian	
17	Craft. I'm here on behalf of Amazon.com with Jacqueline	
18	Lu, Steve Daniels, here on behalf of Best Buy entities,	
19	CDW, Fry's Electronics, Hewlett Packard Company, Micro	
20	Electronics, and Office Depot.	
21	THE COURT: Okay.	
22	MR. HAMMOND: Herbert Hammond on behalf of	
23	Gear Head.	
24	MR. SMITH: Michael Smith on behalf of	
25	Wal-Mart.	

Sunbelt Reporting & Litigation Services

Houston Austin Bryan/College Station Corpus Christi Dallas/Fort Worth East Texas San Antonio

Page 79 1 to -- is the next thing to do is rotatably attached? 2 MR. ZARIAN: We're prepared to address that, Your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Edmonds, have you 5 addressed rotatably attached? MR. EDMONDS: I -- have I addressed theirs? 6 7 No, I was -- I was responding to hinge member. THE COURT: Go ahead and move to rotatably 8 attached, and that may raise some issues I might have 9 with regard to -- I think they're really, you know, kind 10 of arguing the same thing here, but if there's something 11 12 specific you want to present on rotatably attached, go 13 ahead. 14 MR. EDMONDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think that the rotatably attached, the difference between the 15 parties is that they're saying it's limited to one axis 16 17 of rotation, and that's just simply not what the claims 18 say. 19 What the claims require to infringe the claim, you have to have rotatable attachment in one 20 axis, you have to have rotatably attachment in a second 21 22 axis. That's required to infringe the claim. But what they're saying is that you -- you 23 24 can only have rotatable attachment in one axis. 25 there's nowhere that the patent says that. There's

Page 80

- 1 nowhere in the spec, there's nowhere in the claims that
- 2 say that. So the question is are we going to limit
- 3 what's claimed here to the preferred embodiment? The
- 4 preferred embodiment has a pivot joint. The preferred
- 5 embodiment has a hinge joint on one end, a pivot joint
- 6 on the other end. Both of those, fair enough, are --
- 7 are rotating in one axis.
- But it's -- as Phillips says, you're not
- 9 limited to the preferred embodiment. And the question
- of whether somebody is limited to the preferred
- 11 embodiment, if somebody went around saying, the claimed
- 12 invention, the claimed invention, this is what the
- 13 claimed invention is, sometimes that happens, and the
- 14 Courts say, you know, you just -- you just said
- 15 that's the claimed invention. That's all you're going
- 16 to get.
- 17 That's not how this patent was written.
- 18 They're referred to as the preferred embodiments, and
- 19 then, of course, at -- at the end, it made -- to the
- 20 extent it's not -- it wasn't clear at the end of the
- 21 patent, the specification says that we're not limited to
- 22 the preferred embodiment. We're not intending to limit
- 23 this to the preferred embodiments.
- 24 And the case law we cited to the Court says
- 25 exactly that, that if the patentees are not limited to

Page 81 1 the preferred embodiment, there has to be a special case 2 in which they be limited to the preferred embodiment. Here they're not, and this is very much on point to the 3 4 case we cited to the Court. It's very much on point to 5 Phillips for that matter. But I think that's -- that's the issue, 6 7 and -- and with the webcam we have, I think it illustrates the point. This -- this webcam, as we can 8 see, it rotates in an axis. So what -- what the Plaintiff would say is you have an axis of rotation 10 here, you have another axis of rotation that is 11 perpendicular to it, and we say it infringes. 12 13 What the Defendants say is maybe it does 14 that, maybe it doesn't, but they say but it also moves 15 in other directions, and because it does more than what 16 the claim requires, it doesn't infringe. The word 17 comprising is including but not limited to. 18 So the only way their argument works is if 19 the claim -- if the Court follows their admonition and 20 restricts the claim to mean that you can only do what --21 what the claim absolutely requires. You can't do 22 anything else. So, for example, we have a car with head lamps, they'd say, this claim is to a car. If you put 23 24 head lamps on the car, it doesn't infringe because

Sunbelt Reporting & Litigation Services

you're limited to a car.

25

Page 82 1 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Response? 2 MR. ZARIAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 couple of quick points, then I'd like to move to the 4 presentation. But just -- just to distinguish, Your Honor, between the discussion we had about hinge member 5 and rotatably attached, our point with respect to hinge 6 member, and I think the fundamental difference between 7 parties, is that we -- we submit that whatever else the 8 hinge member does, it could have 20 attachments, it's got to have a hinge. There's got to be a hinge on the 10 hinge member, and if it doesn't, it's got to have a 11 hinge member. That's -- that's our construction that 12 It requires a hinge joint. It's as if 13 we've advanced. 14 the claim required head lamps on a car and there were no 15 head lamps. That's where they're taking this claim in 16 terms of an attempt to broaden it. 17 The issue with respect to rotatable 18 attachment does turn on -- on the construction -- the 19 difference with the two constructions. Defendants submit that rotation about an axis means rotation about 20 There must be a single axis. That's all the 21 an axis. patent teaches, that's all that's disclosed, and there's 22 no teaching or any suggestion of any kind in terms of 23 24 these claims and this specification of this patent of 25 anything else.

Sunbelt Reporting & Litigation Services
Houston Austin Bryan/College Station Corpus Christi Dallas/Fort Worth East Texas San Antonio

	Page 98
1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a
4	true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes
5	of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the
6	best of my ability.
7	NDTC√. p
8	March 2, 2012
9	
10	SHELLY MOLMES Date Deputy Official Reporter
11	State of Texas No.: 7804 Expiration Date: 12/31/12
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Job No. 98620